



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the depositary, whose lien in the principal case in fact exceeded the sum collected.

**BILLS AND NOTES — CHECKS — NEGLIGENCE OF DRAWER: NEGLIGENT USE OF PROTECTOGRAPH.** — A bank check for three dollars, otherwise properly drawn, was negligently stamped with a protectograph, "Not over \$500." The payee raised the check to three hundred and sixty dollars and indorsed it to a *bonâ fide* purchaser, who now sues the drawer to recover the face value of the check. *Held*, that he can recover. *Second National Bank of Vincennes v. Campbell*, Ct. App., Hamilton County, Ohio (not yet reported).

If a check or other negotiable instrument is drawn in such a way as to suggest and facilitate the making of alterations which cannot be detected on inspection, a *bonâ fide* purchaser of the altered instrument may recover the full face value. *Garrard v. Haddan*, 67 Pa. St. 82; *Harvey v. Smith*, 55 Ill. 224; see *Young v. Grote*, 4 Bing. 253. *Contra*, *Knoxville National Bank v. Clark*, 51 Ia. 264; *Colonial Bank of Australasia v. Marshall*, [1906] A. C. 559. In the United States the authority to the contrary limits recovery to cases where the relation of banker and customer exists. See *Greenfield Savings Bank v. Stowell*, 123 Mass. 196, 201; 2 DANIEL, NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS, 6 ed., § 1405. But a protectograph stamp is not an essential of a properly drawn check. It is in the nature of the marginal figures, which are not an integral part of the instrument. *Smith v. Smith*, 1 R. I. 398; *Garrard v. Lewis*, 10 Q. B. D. 30. See 1 DANIEL, NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS, 6 ed., § 86. The case is thus not to be judged as if the bank was guilty of negligence in omitting to stamp the draft, "Not over \$5." If the drawer had left the perfectly drawn instrument unstamped, he clearly would not have been liable. *Dana v. Underwood*, 19 Pick. (Mass.) 99; *Smith v. Chester*, 1 T. R. 654. And yet the forger could then have forged the alteration with equal ease and added a protectograph stamp to confirm his forgery. The mere presence of the protectograph, furthermore, cannot be said to have facilitated the alterations, for it was still necessary for the forger himself to erase parts of the existing instrument. By drawing the check properly in all its essential elements, the drawer satisfied his duty to the purchaser; the mere fact that in taking an unrequired precaution to safeguard his own interests, he acted without due care in attaching the protectograph stamp, should not make him liable to a purchaser who placed an uninvited reliance upon the same safeguard. Accordingly the decision in the principal case must be deemed wrong.

**BILLS AND NOTES — DEFENSES — RELEASE OF SECURITY BY PAYEE WITHOUT ASSENT OF SURETY CO-MAKER — NEGOTIABLE INSTRUMENTS LAW.** — The defendants signed a note as surety co-makers. The principal co-maker gave the plaintiff payee a deed of trust on land as security. The plaintiff, with notice of the suretyship relationship and without the assent of the defendants, released this security. *Held*, that the plaintiff cannot recover. *Long v. Shafer*, 171 S. W. 690 (Mo. App.).

The court reaches this result on the ground that a payee cannot be a holder in due course, and that under Section 58 of the Negotiable Instruments Law the instrument is therefore "subject to the same defenses as if it were non-negotiable." At common law, of course, any binding extension of time or release of security by a holder with notice of the suretyship would give a defense to the surety co-maker. *German Savings Ass'n v. Helmrick*, 57 Mo. 100; *Cummings v. Little*, 45 Me. 183; see 59 U. OF PA. L. REV. 532; 1 BRANDT, SURETYSHIP, 3 ed., § 38. But under the Negotiable Instruments Law it has been held that Section 192, making an accommodation maker primarily liable, and Sections 119 and 120, specifying extension of time as a method of releasing a party secondarily liable and not mentioning it for one primarily liable,